A Comparison Between the Effectiveness of Inductive and Deductive Instruction in the L2 English Classroom in a L1 Dutch Environment

Bachelor Thesis English Language and Culture, Utrecht University

Esther Berendse

3467740

Supervisor: Dr. M.C.J. Keijzer

June 2012

Contents

Chapter 1 – Introduction

Over the years, the role of grammar has been one of the most controversial issues in the field of second language teaching. Nowadays, grammar has gained a prominent position in the second language classroom, and people agree that it is "too important to be ignored, and that without a good knowledge of grammar, learners' language development will be severely constrained" (Richards and Renandya "Approaches" 145). Grammar is considered the "sentence-making machine" of a language, and knowledge of grammar gives the learner the ability to create a countless number of original sentences (Zhang 186). It is, furthermore, essential as it provides the basis for communicative competence in writing, speaking, reading, and listening. "Grammatical competence," after all, is "one of communicative competence" (Zhang 184). Current discussions in the field of second language grammar teaching, therefore, no longer centre on whether grammar should be taught or not, but rather on questions such as "[h]ow do we go about teaching grammar items in the most effective way?" (Richards and Renandya "Approaches" 145).

A large and growing body of studies has investigated how learners can most successfully acquire a second language, which has helped teachers to develop ideas about how to teach grammar. However, "with the quantity of published research increasing annually" (Skehan 1), it is often difficult for teachers to judge which method is most beneficial for their students. Since grammar is often believed to be one of the most challenging aspects of a language to both teach and learn, students and teachers benefit from teaching methods that are effective in acquiring grammatical structures.

This thesis, therefore, seeks to investigate one of the most researched methods of teaching grammar: the deductive and inductive method. A deductive approach to teaching grammar items is teacher-centred. The teacher offers rules first and then examples and practice materials. An inductive approach, on the other hand, focuses on the student 'noticing' the grammatical rule him or herself without being made explicitly aware of it. The teacher provides students with examples showing how the concept is used after which they analyse and notice how the concept works for themselves. In particular, it focuses on the context of teaching English grammar to Dutch secondary school students.

This thesis has been organised in the following way. It first provides a brief overview of recent developments in the language teaching field and goes on to outline the methodology of this study, attempting to examine the effectiveness of deductive and inductive instruction. This present study aims to first of all explore the current methods of grammar teaching of English in Dutch secondary schools to teach English and, following that, will attempt to answer the following research question through a data-driven approach: Is the deductive method or inductive method of teaching grammar most effective in the context of Dutch secondary school students learning English? The grammatical feature under investigation here is the past simple versus the present perfect tense as Dutch does not have this distinction and Dutch learners of English are notoriously known to find this difficult.

Chapter 2 – Theoretical Framework

The concept of language teaching methodology has had a long history as reflected in the "rise and fall of a variety of methods throughout the recent history of language teaching" (Richards and Renandya "Teaching" 5). In recent years, Brown argues, we have encountered several "reactions and counter-reactions" to different language teaching methods and approaches (241). All the different methods, however, have been developed in the belief that changes and improvements in teaching methodology will bring about improvements in language teaching and learning (Richards and Rodgers 15). As Richards and Rodgers point out, this notion has been supported by teachers as well as academics and publishers who are "constantly searching for the most effective method" to teach a language (15). Numerous questions such as "what are the effects of varying methodological approaches, textbooks, materials, and teacher styles?" arise in the SLA field (Brown 1). However, it has been argued that "the latest bandwagon 'methodologies' [came] into prominence without much study or understanding" (Lange qtd. in Richards and Rodgers 15). This implies that the SLA field has become opaque as a result of all the works written on the topic of teaching methodology.

2.1 Historical Overview

This section will use a historical approach in reviewing some of the most widely known language teaching methods: the Grammar-Translation Method, the Direct Method, the Audiolingual Method, and, lastly, the Communicative Approach.

The Grammar-Translation Method is one of the most traditional second language teaching methods that dates back to the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. It was originally used to teach extinct languages such as Greek and Latin,

which explains why students were taught grammar and vocabulary through decontexualised translations, thus focusing on the written language and neglecting spoken language.

A significant period in the history of language teaching methods and approaches took place from the 1950s to the 1980s (Richards and Rodgers 15). This period gave rise to the so-called Direct Method and the Audiolingual Method. The former came into existence as a response to the Grammar-Translation Method, as it integrated more use of the target language in the classroom. Students had to speak and think solely in the target language. This method attempted to imitate the conditions under which a first language is most effectively learned: by means of total immersion. This could, however, never be achieved as students were only immersed in an L2 environment at school for about two hours a week. The Audiolingual Method, on the other hand, emphasised repetition and was influenced by the principles of Behaviourism: proponents of this method viewed language learning as habit formation resulting from 'Stimuli, Responses, and Reinforcement.' Dialogues and drills were used to achieve accurate pronunciation and grammar. However, mainly because Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory was also widely accepted as a learning theory in those days, people began to see interaction as essential to the learning process (Saville-Troike 25). Because of that, the theoretical framework of the Audiolingual Method became questioned, and the effectiveness of the method itself was put in doubt as well.

From the 1970s onwards, the traditional methods mentioned were replaced by the so-called Communicative Approach, which in one form or another is still the predominant method used in foreign language classrooms today. Unlike previous

approaches which "did not properly deal with meaning," (Swan 2) the Communicative Approach builds on the notion of language as means of real communication, and its goal is to achieve 'communicative competence.' The approach is built on the belief that "linguistic theory need[s] to be seen as part of a more general theory incorporating communication and culture" (Richards and Rodgers 159). Historically, from the 1970s onwards, this new belief called for new syllabuses that illustrated the idea of communicative competence. As a result, syllabuses were developed that focused on 'functions' rather than 'grammatical structures' (Richards and Rodgers 173). Classroom activities that involved real communication became the norm as they were believed to boost learning. Group work was also stimulated as the Communicative Approach built on activities that involve real communication and "could be used as the basis of a communicative methodology" (Richards and Rodgers 173). On the whole, classroom activities had to involve meaningful tasks since it was believed that "[l]anguage that is meaningful to the learner supports the learning process" (Richards and Rodgers 161). The approach promoted learning activities that engaged students in meaningful and authentic use of language rather than activities that only mechanically practised language structures. Consequently, classroom activities were designed to focus on "completing tasks that are mediated through language or involve negotiation of information and information sharing" (Richards and Rodgers 165).

Richards and Rodgers argue that Communicative Language Teaching should be considered an approach rather than a method as it "refers to a diverse set of principles that reflect a communicative view of language and language learning and that can be used to support a wide variety of classroom procedures" (172). Since students are now regularly exposed to authentic materials and motivating and

captivating exercises which have replaced the rather boring fill-in exercises common in traditional methods, it could be argued that language teaching has made some significant progress under the influence of the Communicative Approach. This view is supported by Swan who argues that "we are [now] able to give our students a better and more complete picture than before of how language is used" (2). Characteristics of the Communicative Approach are nowadays "largely accepted as self-evident and axiomatic throughout the profession" (Richards and Rodgers 173). Richards and Rodgers even argue that "[i]n some sense, almost all of the newer teaching proposals [...] could claim to incorporate principles associated with Communicative Language Teaching" (173). In agreement with this, Brown mentions that the Communicative Approach in fact "capture[s] many of the most recent trends in research and teaching" (218).

2.2 The Role of Grammar in Second Language Teaching

Separate from teaching methods, the role of grammar in language teaching is also an interesting topic. According to R. Ellis, two issues have dominated the language teaching field for many years. First, "[s]hould we teach grammar at al?" and second, "[i]f we teach grammar, how should we teach it?" ("Grammar Teaching" 167). Naturally, there has been little agreement on both issues. As for the first question, R. Ellis brings in Krashen who holds the view that grammar teaching does not bring about acquired knowledge that is "needed to participate in authentic communication" ("Grammar Teaching" 167) and language instruction, thus, seems rather pointless. R. Ellis himself, on the other hand, claims that grammar instruction guides and facilitates second language acquisition though not "in the way teachers often think it does:" it

has a "delayed" effect, he argues, rather than an "instant effect" ("Grammar Teaching"167).

There are still plenty of fallacies when it comes to the role of grammar in language teaching. In 'Second Language Teaching Pedagogy,' Kwakernaak lists five misconceptions regarding grammar instruction. First of all, he argues that teachers often think grammar makes up the fundamental part of a language although grammatical elements in fact carry very little meaning (Kwakernaak 333). Second of all, it is a misconception to believe that grammar lays the foundation of language teaching. Teachers often think that without knowledge of basic grammar, students can do nothing with a foreign language (Kwakernaak 334). Third of all, it is wrongly believed that the more grammar you offer, the more thorough your teaching is. The opposite is, however, true. The quantity of grammar instruction has in fact decreased since communicative relevance has gained importance and students are required to apply grammatical rules rather than learn them, and particular attention is drawn to other skills such as listening, speaking, as well as learning strategies (Kwakernaak 334-335). Fourth of all, it is often misunderstood that one can only learn grammar by learning and practicing grammatical rules (Kwakernaak 335). As a reaction, Kwakernaak points out that input of language use constitutes the "engine" of language acquisition rather than providing grammatical rules; the rules themselves only facilitate the acquisition of grammar (335-336). Lastly, many teachers think they should prevent students from writing or speaking in the foreign language too soon as this would result in making mistakes that are hard to unlearn. They forget, however, that making mistakes is part of the learning process (Kwakernaak 335).

On the whole, the rise of the Communicative Approach has had a significant impact on the nature of language teaching and learning and the role of grammar

teaching in particular had to be revised (Md. Zain 2). The focus on meaning rather than form suggests that grammatical accuracy could be considered less essential in communicative competence. As a result, the esteemed importance of grammar has changed over the last century. There is now a general consensus that grammar must never be a goal in itself; it must instead be seen a building blocks of a language, a tool facilitating listening, reading, speaking, and writing (Kwakernaak 333). The basic idea is that in order to use a language for communicative purposes, one must acquire linguistic as well as communicative competence. Saville-Troike defines the first as "knowledge of specific components and levels of a language" and the latter as "everything that a speaker needs to know in order to communicate appropriately within a particular community" (134). It means, in short, that one does not only need to know about linguistic structure such as grammar and phonology, but also what, when, and how to use that knowledge appropriately. Grammatical competence is viewed as a building block for acquiring communicative competence. Especially in developing productive skills such as speaking and writing, grammar plays a significant role. As a result, the boundary between 'grammar as a tool' and 'grammar as a goal in itself' is often very vague in reality (Kwakernaak 333).

2.2.1. Acquiring a Grammatical Structure

Second language teaching centres on four skills: reading, listening, writing, and speaking. These activities can in turn be classified into two groups: "receptive versus productive skills, and as conveyed by written versus oral modes of communication" (Saille-Troike 137). As mentioned before, grammar is nowadays viewed as a tool for carrying out communicative activities. But what does it actually mean for a student 'to be able to apply a grammatical rule'? In order for him to do so, he does not

actually have to be able to explicitly name the rule. He may well have not even seen or heard of the rule before.

Kwakernaak argues that a grammatical structure has been acquired when it is produced "unconsciously, automatically, and correctly in speech" (Kwakernaak 337 [my translation]). Hence, the main goal of teaching grammar for most teachers is "to help learners internalise the structures taught in such a way that they can be used in everyday communication" (N. Ellis 168). According to Kwakernaak, the problem is, however, that L2 teachers are easily satisfied with the level of proficiency of their students (339). He argues that once a student is able to apply the grammatical structure in mechanical practice, teachers already continue teaching another grammatical structure (339). He illustrates this point clearly with the following scheme, distinguishing five levels of proficiency regarding grammatical structures (337):

1) Receptive proficiency: a student understands the meaning of the structure.

2) Productive proficiency in written form-focused situations: a student can correctly produce the grammatical rule in a written fill-in-the-gap exercise.

3) Productive proficiency in oral form-focused situations: a student can correctly produce the grammatical rule in an orally fill-in-the-gap exercise.

4) Productive proficiency in written content-focused situations: a student can correctly produce the structure when writing a letter.

5) Productive proficiency in orally content-focused situations: a student can produce the grammatical structure when speaking.

Kwakernaak mentions that the contrast between form-focused and content-focused is important to notice (378). Form-focused exercises draw particular attention to the linguistic form of a structure, with or without paying attention to the content. Content-

focused exercises, on the other hand, approximate real-life situations: a student's attention is drawn to the message he or she wants to convey rather than the linguistic form of a structure. The leap from form-focused exercises to content-focused exercises is rather difficult. This can be noticed when students are able to produce a grammatical structure correctly in a gap-filling exercise, but they fail to do so when writing a letter (Kwakernaak 338). This leap should, thus, be facilitated.

2.2.2 Approaches to Teaching Grammar: the deductive versus the inductive approach

A considerable amount has been written on how grammatical rules should be presented. One issue concentrates on whether rules should be presented deductively or inductively; in other words, whether students are presented with the rules directly (deductive approach) or whether they have to figure out the rule for themselves (inductive approach). For many scholars and teachers, Krashen argues, the deductive approach seems "much more reasonable – why make students guess the rule?" (113) Teachers should "present a clear explanation and have [students] practice until the rule [is] internalised" (Krashen 113). Proponents of the deductive approach, however, have argued that the best way to teach grammatical structures is for students to discover the rule for themselves. Within this approach, the learner is given several examples, "a corpus," and has to discover "the regularities" (Krashen 113). The inductive approach bears strong resemblances to first language acquisition though the language is not acquired subconsciously.

But which approach is believed to be most effective in teaching grammatical structures? Teachers and scholars have a wide range of views on whether the

inductive or deductive approach is most effective. It has been suggested that some structures "are most amenable to a deductive approach while others ... can be learned very well by an inductive approach" (Hammerly 17). This view has been supported by Brown, who states that "both inductively and deductively oriented teaching methods can be effective, depending on the goals and contexts of a particular language teaching situation" (105). In general, some scholars argue that there is no difference in effectiveness at all, while others argue that either the deductive or inductive approach is most effective (Ellis "Current Issues" 97-98). For example, Staatsen states that the deductive approach should be discouraged because the inductive approach usually has desired learning outcomes (195). On the other hand, in her study comparing the deductive and inductive approach to teaching foreign languages, Shaffer concludes that there is no significant difference in the effectiveness of both approaches (399); "this offers strong evidence against the notion that an inductive approach should not be used for difficult structures" (399). She also found that the "correlation between ability and approach was not significant" which refutes the idea that an inductive approach would be too difficult for weak or slow students (399). In the final part of her study, Schaffer concludes that teachers should not only apply the inductive approach in their lessons but instead vary (401). On the other hand, an advantage of the inductive method is its "active participation" of students and the fact that grammar is presented in "meaningful contexts" (Schaffer 401).

In general, it is believed that both approaches have their advantages and disadvantages (Kwakernaak 348, summarised in Table 1 below):

Table 1: The advantages and disadvantages of inductive language teaching methods

Disadvantages	Advantages
The inductive approach is rather time-consuming; the deductive approach is faster.	The inductive approach will bring about a greater learning outcome as students have been intensively working on the rule for a rather long time.
The inductive approach takes a lot of needless effort (students will think 'just give us the rule')	Students, however, are activated and become familiar with inductive reasoning, which is beneficial for future learning.
The teacher will make him or herself redundant in the long run when applying the inductive approach.	Induction stimulates an "active and independent" attitude towards grammar. Students will become less dependent on instruction and eventually will no longer think 'grammar is hard, and only a teacher can tell me how to do it.'
Teachers constantly have to be aware of incorrect rules students can come up with inductively.	Making mistakes also occurs in learning a language naturally.
Students are not familiarised with linguistic terms when using the inductive approach.	Students learn how to deal with linguistic concepts, though not specifically with the terms related to it. It is incorrect to think that the abstract form is 'the real rule.' Linguistic terms can be given after the induction process has been completed. The rule will then make sense to students.

It is, however, worth mentioning that the preference for an approach, which is in fact a learning style, differentiates across individuals. As Ellis concludes: "[m]any variables affect which approach learners benefit most from, including the specific structure that is target of the instruction and learners' aptitude for grammatical analysis" ("Current Issues" 98). Consequently, the problem is that the 'wrong' approach could be used, at least for some students. Kwakernaak, however, argues that once students are familiar with the inductive approach, this will be beneficial for their future learning process (344). Students will be able to figure out rules for themselves when there is no teacher that will do it for them. It could, thus, be argued that it is beneficial for all students to familiarise themselves with inductive reasoning.

2.2.3 Implications for Practice and Assessment

Traditionally grammar was practiced by means of decontextualised activities such as fill-in-the-blanks and correct-the-sentence. Even today most people only think of fill-in exercises that are practised individually and checked in class (Kwakernaak 359). These exercises do indeed test grammatical knowledge, but they do not determine whether students can apply grammatical structures correctly in real-life speaking or writing situations. The Communicative Approach, however, induced a shift from "seeing language proficiency in terms of knowledge of structures, which could best be assessed using discrete-point items, to the ability to integrate and use the knowledge in performance, which could best be assessed through the production and comprehension of written texts and through face-to-face interaction under real-time processing conditions" (Larsen-Freeman 533). As a result, receptive as well as productive skills have gained equal importance and hence decontextualised materials should be replaced by exercises testing the productive skills writing and speaking as well. Students must be required to convey a message; hence, exercises should focus on function or content rather than grammatical structure. However, since the transition from being able to fill in a grammatical structure to writing a letter is rather difficult for students (Kwakernaak 366), teachers should facilitate a student's development from the lowest level of command of a grammatical structure to the highest level by varying in the nature of exercises. Kwakernaak proposes several parameters for practicing grammatical structures (353-354):

- Form-focused exercises – content-focused exercises

- Written exercises – oral exercises

- Time pressure – no time pressure

- Use of tools (paradigm, rule, etc.) – no use of tools

- Focus only on one aspect - include other aspects as well (structures that have already been taught before, or even lexical problems)

With the help of these parameters, teachers should be able to construct a series of challenging and varying exercises.

These reforms also have consequences for the way grammatical knowledge is assessed. Traditionally, students were asked to (re)produce rules and paradigms (Kwakernaak 371), and grammatical knowledge was generally assessed by means of applying structures in form-focused exercises. Kwakernaak, however, questions what the value of this is outside of the school environment: students will not have to fill-in gap exercises there (371). An alternative would be grammar-integrated speaking-, writing-, reading-, or listening tests, rather than testing grammar in a "separate section of the test that deals with structure explicitly" (Larsen-Freeman 533). In short, attention should be drawn to testing (communicative) skills rather than testing grammatical competence as a goal in itself.

2.3 Language Teaching in the Netherlands

Naturally, recent developments in language teaching methods and approaches have also influenced language teaching in the Netherlands. Traditionally, language teaching was very limited as it focused only on written skills. Listening and speaking skills were only considered relevant for "waiters and sales representatives" as people often disdainfully said (Kwakernaak 29). Motivation for this was the desire to give foreign language education the same "intellectual status" that the education of classical Latin received (Kwakernaak 29). In the past decade, however, this has changed, and oral skills have gained in importance in foreign language education.

From the 1980s onwards, second language educators in the Netherlands have applied the Communicative Approach. Nowadays, a foreign language is not used as an end in itself but rather as a means of communication and acquiring information. Although most teachers nowadays share that conviction, they do, however, seem to disagree on the role of grammar within this Communicative Approach. Some call for a sustained structural base on which communicative skills are built, while others prefer communicative activities and argue that knowledge of grammar will develop as a function of time (Staatsen 186). Most textbook materials try to strike a happy medium in this matter: they consider grammar as a building block in acquiring communicative competence (Staatsen 186).

Chapter 3 – A Comparison Between the English and Dutch Language on Specific Aspects

When learning a second language, Saville-Troike states, a first step is to realise that "certain aspects of languages are universal, but how they are expressed may vary greatly" (145). When comparing Dutch and English, it becomes evident that both languages have several features in common as they are both West-Germanic languages and, thus, typologically similar. For example, English and Dutch have rather similar sound systems. Dutch learners thus do not tend to have many serious problems perceiving or producing English sounds. However, both languages differ especially with regard to grammatical features. When L1 speakers of Dutch learn English as a L2, they therefore face some serious grammatical issues. Consequently, incorrect transfer or L1 knowledge into English happens regularly.

      For example, Dutch learners of English often have difficulties formulating questions or negatives since this requires a so-called dummy-do in English. Since Dutch does not require this auxiliary, learners may produce sentences such as '*Drives he a car?' instead of 'Does he drive a car?' Differences in word order can also pose problems. In Dutch, SVO word order can be changed in some sentences. For example, you can say 'Gisteren schilderde Tom de muur' whereas you cannot say '*Yesterday painted Tom the wall' in English.

      The tense issue under investigation in this thesis often poses even greater problems for Dutch pupils. Although the Dutch tense system is rather similar to the English one with its past, present, perfect, future, progressive, and passive tense, Dutch students find English tenses one of the most difficult aspects of the English language to learn. One of the reasons is that the English tenses do not correspond to the Dutch ones. That is to say, whereas English requires the past simple in some

contexts, Dutch may also use the present perfect. For example, Dutch speakers may use the present perfect in 'Ik ben gisteren naar de winkel geweest' (*I've been to the shop yesterday), as well as the past simple 'Ik ging gisteren naar de winkel' (I went to the shop yesterday), without significant interpretation differences. In English, however, the past simple indicates that the period of action has come to an end, whereas the present perfect indicates the action has continued up to the present time and bears "current relevance" (Quirk et al. 190). It is, thus, incorrect to use the present perfect tense in the latter sentence. The word 'yesterday' expresses that the action took place in the past and that the past simple should be exclusively used. The choice between both tenses is "associated with time orientation, and therefore with the choice and interpretation of time adverbials" (Quirk et al. 194). Adverbials such as 'yesterday,' 'a week ago,' and 'last Monday' indicate that an action took place at a specific point, whereas 'up to now,' 'so far,' and 'since' indicate that a period leads up to the present moment (Quirk et al. 194). Overall, students usually find it very difficult to distinguish between when to use the past simple and when to use the present perfect tense and consequently produce sentences such as *'I lived here since 2009' instead of 'I have lived here since 2009.' In the classroom, the confusion between tenses can lead to rather funny remarks. For example, Dutch learners of English often reason that a person is obviously dead when one says 'He lived there until 2009.'

Chapter 4 – Method

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effectiveness of deductive and inductive instruction when learning grammatical structures in an ESL classroom with Dutch secondary school pupils. In general, Dutch pupils find English grammar rather hard, which is why it seemed interesting to investigate the effectiveness of different approaches towards grammar teaching. Since the English tenses, particularly the distinction between the past simple and present perfect tense, are usually considered most difficult of all, it was decided to use these grammatical features for this study.

4.1 Participants

The participants in this study were 54 secondary school pupils within an age range of 13-14 (mean age was 13.57 with a standard deviation of 0.50). The students were divided over two groups: a deductively taught group and an inductively taught group with respectively 28 and 26 pupils. There was a roughly equal distribution of gender across and within both groups. Students were in their second year of O.R.S. Lek en Linge, which is a regional, public comprehensive school in the rural area of Culemborg. This school attracts students from Culemborg as well as students from other local areas such as Geldermalsen, Tricht, Buren, and Beest.

Students participated involuntarily as the study was carried out during their regular English classes which were mandatory for them. Nevertheless, students were encouraged to participate actively since the material discussed in class would eventually be assessed by their regular teacher. Both groups were found to be homogenous in terms of language abilities based on previous performance in class (the average mark was between a 6 and a 7.5 on a 10-point scale in both classes) and,

crucially, on the outcomes of a grammaticality judgement task (GJT) that was administered before the inductive or deductive grammar instructions sessions (a more detailed description of the GTJ is provided in 4.2 below). However, by means of a brief questionnaire preceding the GJT, it was assessed that students in the deductively taught group enjoyed English classes significantly more than students in the other class. This might have influenced the results, as the former group could be more motivated in participating than the latter one (see Results and Discussion for this).

4.2 Materials

Three grammaticality judgement tasks in which students had to judge sentences on a binary scale: 'correct' and 'incorrect' (or 'I do not know') were administered as part of a pre-post test design. In addition, a third GJT retention test was administered six weeks following the posttest. The first task, the pre-test, was also partly included to determine whether both classes were homogenous in terms of grammar abilities and to determine what students already knew with regard to the present prefect and past simple tense. Both tenses were explicitly taught to the students in the beginning of their second year, about seven months ago of the time of testing. Students were first taught the past simple and consequently the present perfect as this was the order of the teaching method *Stepping Stones* they used in class. Both structures were taught deductively: the teacher explicitly taught the rules first. As part of this sstudy, a brief questionnaire was administered before the GJT to collect more background information on all the students. Both the pretest and the questionnaire (which was included as an introduction to the pretest) can be found in Appendix E. All three GJT's consisted of three main parts: twelve sentences focusing on the past simple, twelve sentences that tapped into the present perfect, and six fillers. The posttest and

retention task, which can be found in Appendix F and G, consisted of six additional

fillers in order to distract the students even more from the actual features under

investigation. All sentences were, in turn, equally split into correct and incorrect

sentences. Naturally, all sentences were randomly shuffled and the order was

therefore also different on all three tests. Sentences on the past simple consisted of

simplex past sentences, irregular versus regular verb sentences, and dummy-do

insertion or inversion sentences. See (1) below for an example.

1. Did you see that film on television last night?

Sentences testing the present perfect consisted of sentences that show something

happened in the past and is still continuing into the present or presently relevant,

sentences that show grammatical adverbs or signal words, and sentences that show an

action set in at an unspecified time before the present but the importance of the effect

carrying relevance in the present time. See (2) below for an example.

2. *Bob and Alice are married. They are married for 20 years.

Lastly, the fillers dealt with matters such as prepositions of time, English plural, and

word order to distract students from the actual features under investigation. Tenses

were, thus, assessed in every conceivable form.

4.3 Procedure

During three days over a period of two weeks, participants took part in three lessons

of respectively 15 minutes, 45 minutes, and 15 minutes each. Between day one and

two, there was a one-day lapse; between day two and three, there was a six-day lapse. Six weeks after the posttest was carried out, both classes completed a retention task. All sessions took place during their regular English classes and the language of instruction was Dutch. On the first day, both groups received a GJT. Students were told they were to participate in a BA thesis study that would investigate how good they already were on difficult grammatical constructions such as the present perfect and past simple tense. It was stressed that they would not get a mark for the test but that the point was to test their intuitions about the sentences, so as to reduce anxiety levels. Because the concept 'grammatical' was not clear for many students, this was explained as well. Students were also told that an initial hunch usually is the best one, and that they had to judge the sentences immediately after reading. Lastly, they were told they had to do the assignment individually and finish within ten minutes. Most students, however, did not need that much time.

On the second day, both groups received instruction. The teaching materials used for the deductive group are included in Appendix A and the materials used for the inductive group can be found in Appendix C. The deductive group received metalinguistic information and the rules underlying the grammatical concept for about twenty minutes. The concepts were illustrated with some examples. An error identification activity, which can be found in Appendix B, followed the explicit instruction. Students were presented with a dialogue between two men talking about their past and were asked to find incorrect instances of the past simple or present perfect and consequently correct them. After ten minutes, the teacher discussed the assignment by asking the students which instances were wrong and why students considered them wrong.

The inductive group, on the other hand, did not first receive rules or metalinguistic information but were immediately presented with a dialogue that is included in Appendix D. As the dialogue was read out loud, students were asked to pay attention to how the men formulated their sentences about things that had happened in the past. In other words, students had to 'observe' the tenses used. After having observed the structures, it was explained what students had to do in the next 25 minutes. First of all, students were asked to find as many instances of English tenses in the dialogue as possible. They were told to ignore present tenses such as "She is at her parents'." Second of all, they had to consider which examples belonged together and organise them in two columns. After this, students were asked to reason why this distinction was made; in other words, what the examples in both columns expressed, and in what situations each of the instances were used. Consequently, they had to formulate a rule for both constructions in order to explain how confirmative sentences are formulated. Lastly, they were asked to do the same for questions. In order to facilitate the induction process, Kwakernaak proposes that a paradigm, table, or partial rule can be presented in advance which students then have to fill in or complete (346). However, because it was predicted that most students would understand that the two columns represented the past simple and present perfect and had knowledge of these metalinguistic terms (as they were already familiar with the terms), it was decided not to do this. Nevertheless, students' progress was monitored carefully and intervention was offered when needed. After students did the assignment, it was checked and discussed in class step by step by means of two columns (one for the past simple and one for present perfect) that were filled in on the chalkboard for about 15 minutes.

On the third day, both groups received a grammaticality judgement task again. Once again, for most students it took less than ten minutes to complete the test.

Six weeks later, both groups completed the retention task in order to test whether the information offered in the instruction session was retained. Because some time had lapsed, they were once again told they had to work individually, that they did not get a mark for it, and that they would have 10 minutes to complete the task.

Chapter 5 – Results

This chapter presents the results of several (independent and paired sample) t-tests that were carried out in order to determine whether any significant difference could be found between the effectiveness of the deductive and inductive approach in learning the English past simple and present perfect tense by Dutch teenagers on basis of a GJT.

5.1 Effect of Gender and Age

Because it was not part of the research question to determine whether there would be a significant difference between the inductively taught group and the deductively group in terms of gender, no statistics were run on these numbers. In addition, there was a rather equal distribution of gender across and within the two conditions: 14 males and 12 females in the inductive approach, 12 males and 15 females in the deductive approach.

It is, furthermore, apparent from Table 2 that there was no significant difference between the two groups in terms of age since the significance level of t value ($t(52) = 1.135$, $p = .262$) for this result was greater than .05.

Table 2: The effect of age on the results (N=54)

	Age range	Mean age (and SD)
Inductive approach (n=26)	13-14	13.65 (0.49)
Deductive approach (n=28)	13-14	13.50 (0.51)

5.2 Effect of Motivation

As mentioned before, it was found that the deductively taught group enjoyed English classes more than the other group which might influence the results (section 4.1). According to the results in Table 3, the difference between the two groups in terms of motivation was significant: $t(40.911) = -2.806$, $p < .05$. It is important to note that it was the deductive group rather than the inductive group that was more motivated from the start.

Table 3: The effect of motivation on the results (N=52)

	Range of motivation scores	Mean motivation score (and SD)
Inductive approach (n=24)	0-1	0.50 (0.51)
Deductive approach (n=27)	0-1	0.85 (0.36)

5.3 The Effect of Scores in the English Classroom

As the results in Table 4 present, there was no significant difference between the two groups in terms of how good students indicated they were regarding the subject English: $t(51) = .925$, $p = .359$. In other words, on the basis of their self-assessed scores in the English classroom the two groups were not significantly different from the outset.

Table 4: The effect of scores in the English classroom (N=53)

	Range	Mean score (and SD)
Inductive approach (n=26)	0 = low scorer 1 = mid range scorer 2 = good scorer	1.38 (0.57)
Deductive approach (n=27)	0 = low scorer 1 = mid range scorer 2 = good scorer	1.22 (0.70)

5.4 Pretest Results

It can be seen from the data in Table 5 that there was no significant difference

between how well both groups did on the GJT in relation to the past simple on the

pretest: $t(52) = .052$, $p = .959$.

This was also true for the present perfect tense, as illustrated by the results in

Table 5 below: $t(52) = .085$, $p = .933$. It was, thus, not the case that one of the two

groups was already better at the past simple or present perfect than the other group

before the instruction was actually given.

Table 5: Mean scores and standard deviations on the past simple in the pretest

(N=54)

	Mean score (and SD) pretest GJT simple past (max = 10)	Mean score (and SD) pretest GJT present perfect (max = 10)
Inductive approach (n=26)	7.38 (2.04)	6.04 (1.76)
Deductive approach (n=28)	7.36 (1.85)	6.00 (1.59)

5.5 Improvement in the Past Simple

5.5.1 Deductive Approach

In Table 6, the scores on the pretest and posttest are outlined. Based on these results,

there was no significant correlation between how well students in the deductive

approach did on the pretest and how well they did on the posttest: $r = 2.12$, $p < .279$.

There was, however, a significant difference in the scores. In other words, the

students in the deductive approach did significantly better in the posttest compared to

the pretest in relation to the past simple: $t(27) = -2.299$, $p < .05$.

Table 6: Mean scores and standard deviations on the past simple in the pre and posttest (N=53)

	Score pretest (and SD) GJT simple past	Score posttest (and SD) GJT simple past
Deductive approach (n=28)	7.36 (1.85)	8.32 (1.68)
Inductive approach (n=25)	7.28 (2.01)	8.24 (1.56)

5.5.2 Inductive Approach

Based on the scores on the pre and posttest in Table 6, it can be concluded that there was a significant correlation between how well students in the inductive approach did on the pretest and how well they did on the posttest: $r = .535$, $p < .01$.

Like in the deductive approach, there was a significant difference in the scores. The students in the inductive approach, thus, did significantly better in the posttest compared to the pretest: $t(24) = -2.716$, $p < .05$.

5.6 Improvement in the Present Perfect

5.6.1 Deductive Approach

As can be seen from Table 7, there was no significant correlation between how well students in the deductive approach did on the pretest and how well they did on the posttest: $r = -.120$, $p = .553$.

There was, however, a significant difference in the scores. The students in the deductive approach did significantly better in the posttest compared to the pretest in relation to the present perfect: $t(26) = -4.087$, $p < .001$.

Table 7: Mean scores and standard deviations on the present perfect in the pre and posttest (N=52)

	Score pretest (and SD) GJT present perfect	Score posttest (and SD) GJT present perfect
Deductive approach (n=27)	5.193 (1.57)	7.85 (1.70)
Inductive approach (n=25)	6.00 (1.78)	6.96 (1.86)

5.6.2 Inductive Approach

Table 7 above shows no significant correlation between how well students in the inductively taught group did on the pretest and how well they did on the posttest: r = .302, p = .142.

Again, there was, however, a significant difference in the scores. The students in the inductive approach did significantly better in the posttest compared to the pretest in relation to the present perfect as shown in Table 7: t(24) = -2.232, p < . 05. It should be pointed out that the effect here is smaller than in the case of the simple past (p = .014 in the latter case and .035 here), and also smaller when compared to the deductive approach (which was .001), but the effect remains.

5.7 Instances of Insecurity

As described in the method section, students could choose between correct, incorrect, or I don't know when judging the sentences in the GJT on their grammaticality. A t-test was carried out in order to determine whether there was a significant difference between the 'I don't knows' used per condition in the pre and the posttest.

In Table 8, the number of I don't know instances are outlined. It should be pointed out that the present perfect and simple past are merged here as categories, so the number of I don't know instances in the pre and posttest include both the past simple and present perfect.

Overall, it can be said that not so many students used the option I don't know, but the number was significantly higher in the inductive approach (more so than in the deductive approach). This group may, thus, have been more apprehensive from the outset.

In addition, although the deductive group did not start using the option I don't know any more or less on the posttest compared to the pretest (despite the fact that there was a significant correlation between the number of times this option was used on both tests: $r = .438$, $p < .05$), this was the case for the inductive approach: they did not use the I don't know option as much any more on the posttest when compared to the pretest and were apparently more confident; moreover, the two instances were correlated: $r = .774$, $p < 001$; $t(25) = 3.725$, $p < 001$.

Table 8: Results of I don't know instances (N=54)

	Don't know instances on pretest (and SD)	Don't know instances on posttest (and SD)
Inductive approach (n=26)	1.38 (1.90)	0.50 (1.61)
Deductive approach (n=28)	0.25 (0.52)	0.18 (0.61)

5.8 Retention Task

Based on the results of Table 9, both groups were found to significantly differ from each other on the retention task regarding the present perfect tense. The deductive group turned out to be significantly better than the inductive group: $t(50) = -2.323$, $p < .05$. Although the deductive group also obtained higher scores regarding the past simple on the retention task, as can be seen in Table 10, this difference was not significant: $t(49) = -1.375$, $p = .175$.

5.8.1 Deductive Group

When comparing the posttest and retention task, there was no significant improvement or decrease in the simple past scores of the deductive group: (r = .244, p = .230): t(25) = .712, p = .48. The same was true for the present perfect tense: (r = .377, p = 0.58): t(25) = .306, p = .762. When comparing the pretest and retention task, however, the deductive group had significantly improved on the present perfect aspect: (r = .253, p = .204): t(26) = -4.335, p < .000, but not on the simple past aspect: (r = .279, p = .168): t(25) = -1.779, p = .087.

5.8.2 Inductive Group

A different picture emerged for the inductive group: there was a significant decrease in the past simple retention task scores as compared to the posttest: (r = .476, p < .05): t(23) = 2.506, p < .05. In other words, although they had initially improved on the past simple when measured from the pretest to the posttest these effects were gone when the same students were tested again as part of the retention task. Although a decrease in scores could also be observed within this group on the present perfect tense, this was not significant: (r = .552, p < .005): t(23) = 1.553, p = .134.

No significant increase or decrease was found in this group when the pretest and the retention task were compared and this was true for both the past simple: (r = .293, p = .155): t(24) = -.087, p = .931 and present perfect: (r = 5.23, p < .01): t(24) = -1.095, p = .284. The inductive group, thus, performed on the same level before all the training and on the retention task (six weeks after they had received inductively-based training).

Table 9: Mean scores and standard deviations on the present perfect in the pre-, post-, and retention test (N=52)

	Score pretest (and SD)	Score posttest (and SD)	Score retention test (and SD)
Deductive approach (n=26)	6.00 (1.62)	7.77 (1.68)	7.65 (1.77)
Inductive approach (n=26)	6.12 (1.74)	7.04 (1.85)	6.46 (2.02)

Table 10: Mean scores and standard deviations on the past simple in the pre-, post-, and retention test (N=50)

	Score pretest (and SD)	Score posttest (and SD)	Score retention test (and SD)
Deductive approach (n=26)	7.23 (1.84)	8.35 (1.52)	8.04 (2.01)
Inductive approach (n=24)	7.24 (1.94)	8.17 (1.48)	7.21 (1.93)

5.8.3 Instances of Insecurity

The number of I don't know instances in the inductive group was not significantly different when comparing the posttest and the retention task: $r = .883$, $p < .000$: $t(24) = -.768$, $p = .450$. Students in the inductive group were, however, significantly more confident in the retention task when compared to the pretest: $r = .730$, $p < .000$: $t(24) = 3.024$, $p < .01$.

The number of I don't know instances in the deductive group was not significantly different when comparing the retention task with the posttest: $r = .118$, $p = .557$: $t(26) = -.225$, $p = .823$ and pretest: $r = .290$, $p = .142$: $t(26) = .527$, $p = .602$.

In addition, the difference between how many times both groups used the option I don't know on the retention task was not significant either: $t(32.120) = -.241$, $p = .193$.

Chapter 6 – Discussion

The present study was designed to determine whether there would be a significant difference between the effectiveness of the deductive and inductive approach when teaching the English past simple and present perfect to Dutch secondary school pupils. Prior studies have commented on how grammar rules should best be presented, but there seems to be no general consensus.

This study found, first of all, that both the inductive and deductive group performed significantly better on both the past simple tense and present perfect tense in the posttest when compared to the pretest. Both methods, thus, seem effective when teaching the past simple and present perfect to Dutch pupils. The differences in scores between the posttest and pretest described above could, however, be attributed to the fact that the posttest was administered only one week after the instruction session. Linguistic knowledge was, thus, still in students' short-term memory. In addition, both tenses were already taught before and students, thus, spent more time on both structures, thus consolidating their already existing knowledge base, which in turn could have resulted in these outcomes.

R. Ellis, on the other hand, claims that, unlike many teachers think, grammar instruction has a "delayed effect" rather than an instant one ("Grammar Teaching" 176). According to R. Ellis, the improvement visible in the posttest should, thus, not be considered the actual effect of grammar teaching. As for the retention task, it was quite surprising that the deductive group retained their knowledge on the past simple and present perfect in the retention task as no significant increase or decrease was found when comparing the posttest and retention task. The inductive group, on the other hand, showed a significant decrease in past simple scores (the decrease in present perfect scores was not significant). It is striking that these students appear to

have forgotten everything at the time of the retention task; even students who had initially shown progress as part of the posttest seem to have forgotten everything. The 'delayed effect,' thus, seems to be zero.

There are several possible explanations for this result. First of all, the role of motivation should be considered as this might have played a role in the outcomes of the study. Because students were already taught the present perfect and past simple before, the level of motivation might have decreased in both groups. In addition, although it was not reflected in the results of the pretest, it was determined by means of the questionnaire that the deductive group enjoyed English classes significantly more than the inductive group. If students in the inductive group were, thus, not willing to pay attention during the instruction session or do his/her best on the tests, this would have consequences for the outcome of the study.

In addition, because the rule-discovering process was new to the students, they might have had troubles participating actively in this time-consuming and rather difficult process. This would also explain why the deductive group was significantly better on the present perfect in the retention task than the inductive group (and also better on the past simple although not significantly). After all, the deductive group received instruction in the way they were used to: deductively, while the inductive group also had to familiarise themselves with a new approach first. Teachers, in general, tend to apply the deductive approach as the main means of instruction, as was the case in the two groups tested. If students in the inductive group were indeed having troubles with the inductive approach and consequently failed to do the rule-discovering assignment, the idea of the induction process is completely lost. It could be argued that students should, thus, be familiarised with the inductive method first before applying it as the sole means of instruction. Once students are familiar with

analysing data and discovering rules for themselves, this will most likely bring about positive learning effects (Kwakernaak 348; Krashen 113; Staatsen 195). After all, one main advantage of the inductive method is active participation (Schaffer 401), but students must first be motivated and understand how to do so.

The findings can, however, also be said to corroborate the ideas of Hammerly and Brown, who suggest that some structures are simply best taught inductively while others are best taught deductively (17; 105). It could be argued that the present perfect (the deductive group performs significantly better on this aspect when comparing the pretest and posttest), or even English tenses in general (the deductive group retains linguistic information at the time of the retention task), can best be learned deductively and that the inductive approach will most likely be effective in teaching other grammatical aspects of the English language.

Overall, the findings of this study once again suggest that Dutch pupils find the English tenses difficult: although the tenses had been taught before, students still made many mistakes on the past simple and particularly on the present perfect in the pretest, which suggests that these structures had still not been internalised. In addition, students in the inductive group seemed to have forgotten everything at the time of the retention test, as they performed on the same level before all the instruction was given. It is self-explanatory to say that one instruction session of 45 minutes is not enough to generate an effect in the long-term (the delayed effect). The findings of this study do, however, suggest that the deductive method is effective when teaching English tenses to Dutch pupils. They might, however, still need several additional instruction sessions in order to acquire English tenses even better. In addition, students should be familiarised with and understand the inductive method first in order to generate beneficial learning outcomes.

Chapter 7 – Conclusion

One of the current discussions in the second language teaching field is centred on the effectiveness of grammar instruction methods. This debate has revolved around the question of how grammar should best be instructed. The present study was designed to determine the effect of two of the most well-known language teaching methods: the inductive and deductive method. In the deductive method students are presented with the rules after which they practice them. In the inductive method, on the other hand, students are presented with 'data' after which they have to figure out the rule for themselves. This study has shown that both methods generate positive learning outcomes in the posttest (short-term); however, effects that were present here in the inductive group appear to be minimised when tested again in the retention task. This was, however, not the case for the deductive group when comparing the posttest and retention test: they retained the linguistic information. On the basis of this study's results, the deductive method does, thus, turn out to be most effective at least for the long-term.

It must, however, be pointed out that the findings in this thesis are subject to at least two limitations. First, grammar instruction took place in only one lesson that consisted of 45 minutes. It could be argued that the instruction was rather brief which could in turn have led to the finding that students forgot again about the tenses six weeks after the posttest. In addition, students' behaviour played an important role: if they were not motivated to pay attention during this specific session, it might have had consequences for the outcomes of the study. Second, the grammatical features under investigation had already been taught before which might have affected the

outcomes of the study. Prior knowledge might have influenced the rule-discovering process: students could have tried to remember rules instead of discovering the rules.

Overall, the current findings add to a growing body of literature on language teaching methods. In addition, this thesis adds substantially to teachers' understanding of grammar teaching. Taken together, this thesis has some implications for teaching practices. Although the outcomes of the study indicate that the deductive approach is effective when teaching English tenses, it nevertheless supports strong recommendations for teachers to familiarise students with the inductive method. As Brown argues: "[c]lassroom learning tend to rely more than it should on deductive reasoning" (104). "While it may be appropriate at times to articulate a rule and then proceed to its instances, most of the evidence in communicative second language learning points to the superiority of an inductive approach to rules" (Brown 104-105). In addition, teachers should make sure to incorporate rules in meaningful and authentic tasks; after all, this is what the Communicative Approach attempts to do. Another important practical implication is that teachers should, consequently, vary in practising and assessment materials: they should use more than simply fill-in-the-blanks exercises in practice.

This study has thrown up some questions in need of further investigation. R. Ellis has claimed that grammar instruction has a "delayed effect" rather than an instant one (167), and results showed that the deductive approach turned out to have an effect in the long-term. However, because this investigation was limited to only two groups of 54 pupils in total who were not familiar with the inductive method, further work will need to be done to determine whether the inductive method will be effective when teaching English tenses to students who are already familiar with the approach, or whether the inductive approach is simply not effective when teaching

tenses but is when teaching other grammatical aspects. Since pupils were already taught the English tenses before but appeared to have forgotten everything at the time of testing, it would be interesting for further research to determine whether the deductive method can also have an effect over a longer period of time when teaching the past simple and present perfect or whether Dutch pupils in general simply have too many difficulties regarding English tenses and will never fully internalise both structures.

References

Brown, Douglas H. *Principles of Language Learning And Teaching*. White Plains:

Pearson Longman, 2007. Print.

Ellis, Nick C. "Optimizing the Input: Frequency and Sampling in Usage-Based and

Form- Focused Learning." *The Handbook of Language Teaching*. Ed. Michael

H. Long and Catherine J. Doughty. West Sussex: Blackwell Publishing, 2009.

139-158. Web.

Ellis, Rod. "Current Issues in the Teaching of Grammar: An SLA Perspective."

TESOL Quarterly. 40.1 (2006): 83-107. Web.

Ellis, Rod. "Grammar Teaching – Practice or Consciousness-Raising?" *Methodology*

in Language Teaching. Ed. Jack C. Richards. Cambridge: Cambridge

University Press, 2002. 167-174. Web.

Hammerly, H. "The Deduction/Induction Controversy." *Modern Language Journal*.

LIX (1975): 15-18. Web.

Krashen, Stephen D. *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. 1st

Internet Ed. Pergamon Press, 1982. Web.

Kwakernaak, Erik. *Didactiek van het Vreemdetalenonderwijs*. Bussum: Uitgeverij

Couthino, 2009. Print.

Larsen-Freeman. "Teaching and Testing Grammar." *The Handbook of Language*

Teaching. Ed. Michael H. Long and Catherine J. Doughty. West Sussex:

Blackwell Publishing, 2009. 518-542. Web.

Md. Zain, Siti Rohani. *Teaching of Grammar : Teachers' Beliefs, Instructional*

Contexts and Practices. PhD Thesis University Sains Malaysia, 2007. Web.

Quirk, Randolph and Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, Jan Svartvik. *A*

Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language. Pearson Longman, 1985.

Richards, Jack C. and Willy A. Renandya. "Approaches to Teaching." *Methodology in Language Teaching.* Ed. Jack C. Richards. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. 5-8. Web.

Richards, Jack C. and Willy A. Renandya. "Teaching Grammar." *Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010. Web.

Richards, Jack C. and Theodore S. Rodgers. *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001. Print.

Saville-Troike, Muriel. *Introducing Second Language Acquisition*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006. Print.

Shaffer, Constance. "A Comparison of Inductive and Deductive Approaches to Teaching Foreign Languages." *The Modern Language Journal*. 73.4 (1989): 395-403. Web.

Skehan, Peter. *Individual Differences in Second-Language Learning*. New York: Routledge, 1989. Print.

Staatsen, Francis. *Moderne Vreemde Talen in de Onderbouw*. Bussum: Uitgeverij Couthino, 2009. Print.

Swan, Michael. "A Critical Look at the Communicative Approach (1)." *ELT Journals*. 39.1 (1985): 2-12. Web.

Zhang, Jianyun. "Necessity of Grammar Teaching." *International Educational Studies*. 2.2 (2009): 184-187. Web.

Appendices

Appendix A: Lesson Plan Deductive Approach

Student	Teacher	Method	Time	Materials
Listens	Explain why I'm there and what we are going to do.	In class	5 minutes	
Listens, asks questions	Explain Past Simple: - Gebeurtenissen/situaties in het verleden die nu zijn afgelopen: signaalwoorden. - Regel: ww + ed of 2e rijtje irregular verbs. "John cut his finger last week" "I lived in New York City for 10 years" - Regel: vraagzinnen (Did + hele ww). "Did you go on holiday?"	In class	7 minutes	Whiteboard

Listens, asks questions	Explain Present Perfect:
	
	- Iets is gebeurd in het verleden en resultaat is zichtbaar in het heden
	  o "She's happy because she has passed her exam" (NL: *heeft gehaald*)
	- Ergens op een onspecifiek tijdstip in het verleden (NIET in combinatie met *last year, last week, yesterday* etc.) Signaalwoorden: *yet, already, never, ever, so far*, etc.
	  o "I've (never) been to France"
	- Iets is in het verleden begonnen en nu nog bezig.
	  o "She has played tennis since she was
		In class	10 minutes	Whiteboard

	eight years old" - Regel: have/has + voltooid deelwoord (regelmatig –ed of onregelmatig 3e rijtje) - Regel vraagzinnen			
Listens	Explains the difference between both forms: "I lived in Culemborg for 10 years" "I have lived in Culemborg for 10 years"	In class	3 minutes	Whiteboard
Listens, makes assignment	Hands out assignment and explains what students will have to do.	In class	10 minutes	Assignment
Participates, answers questions	Discusses assignment. Which instances were wrong and why? Also asks why the other instances were correct.	In class	10 minutes	Assignment, whiteboard

Appendix B: Assignment Deductive Approach

Onderstreep alle fout gebruikte vormen van de present perfect en past simple in onderstaande dialoog.

Dialogue

Tom: Hi Henry, how are you?

Henry: Hi Tom! It's great to see you again. I'm tired because I travelled a long way. I've just come back from Canada.

Tom: Really, what did you do in Canada?

Henry: I took a nature tour there last week.

Tom: Wow! Did you see many wild animals there?

Henry: Of course! It was so interesting. Did you ever spend a holiday in Canada?

Tom: Yes, I have travelled around Canada twice so far.

Henry: Oh wow! How's Alice by the way?

Tom: Alice has been away for the past two weeks. She is at her parents' in London.

Henry: Did you meet her in London?

Tom: Yes, we have met at college in 2005. I lived in London for 5 years as well. We moved to Culemborg in 2010, so we only lived here for two years.

Henry: How time flies!

Appendix C: Lesson Plan Inductive Approach

Student	Teacher	Method	Time	Materials
Listens	Explain why I'm there and what we are going to do.	In class	5 minutes	
Listens, makes assignment	Hands out assignment. Explains what students have to do.	In class, individually	25 minutes	Assignment
Participates, answers questions.	Writes scheme on board and asks students to fill it in. Corrects students if necessary.	In class	15 minutes	Assignment, Whiteboard

Appendix D: Assignment Inductive Approach

<u>Analyseoefening</u>

Ik zal zo een dialooggesprek oplezen tussen twee mannen die praten over hun ervaringen en leven. Ik wil dat jullie erop gaan letten <u>hoe</u> de mannen zinnen formuleren over dingen die in het <u>verleden</u> zijn gebeurd.

Tom: Hi Henry, how are you?

Henry: Hi Tom! It's great to see you again. I'm tired because I have travelled a long way. I've just come back from Canada.

Tom: Really, what did you do in Canada?

Henry: I took a nature tour there last week.

Tom: Wow! Did you see many wild animals there?

Henry: Of course! It was so interesting. Have you ever spent a holiday in Canada?

Tom: Yes, I have travelled around Canada twice so far.

Henry: Oh wow! How's Alice by the way?

Tom: Alice has been away for the past two weeks. She is at her parents' in London.

Henry: Did you meet her in London?

Tom: Yes, we met at college in 2005. I lived in London for 5 years as well. We moved to Culemborg in 2010, so we've only lived here for two years.

Henry: How time flies!

1. Probeer voor jezelf zoveel mogelijk gebruikte tijdsvormen uit de dialoog te halen en noteer deze. Je laat dus zaken zoals "She is at her parents'" buiten beschouwing want hier wordt de present simple gebruikt, het gaat om de tegenwoordige tijd.

2. Welke voorbeelden horen bij elkaar denk je? Sorteer de voorbeelden in twee kolommen.

3. Je hebt bij vraag 2 een onderscheid gemaakt tussen twee tijdsvormen. Waarom heb je dit onderscheid gemaakt? Wat doen beide tijdsvormen naar jouw idee? Met andere woorden, in wat voor een situatie worden ze gebruikt?

4. Probeer bij beide tijdsvormen een regel op te stellen die verklaart hoe je bevestigende zinnen formuleert.

5. Doe dit ook voor vraagzinnen.

Appendix E: GJT (Pretest)

Is this sentence correct or incorrect?

Naam: *jongen / meisje*

Leeftijd:

Vind je het vak Engels leuk?

Hoe goed ben je in het vak Engels?   *goed / gemiddeld / matig / onvoldoende*

In deze opdracht moet je de gegeven zinnen beoordelen op hun grammaticaliteit: zijn de zinnen grammaticaal geformuleerd of niet? Je hoeft dus niet te letten op spelling en interpunctie. Je hebt steeds 3 opties waaruit je kunt kiezen bij het beoordelen van de zinnen: correct, incorrect, of ik weet het niet. Je hoeft zinnen verder niet te verbeteren. Meestal is je eerste antwoord goed, dus geef na het lezen van iedere zin direct antwoord. Je krijgt 10 minuten voor de opdracht, maar waarschijnlijk zul je niet zoveel tijd nodig hebben. Het is wel belangrijk dat je alleen werkt.

Een voorbeeld:

My sister really like shopping.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   ⊠   O   O

Beoordeel de volgende zinnen op hun grammaticaliteit:

1. I visited my grandparents last weekend.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   O   O   O

2. Did you see that film on television last night?

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   O   O   O

3. I have never seen a dolphin in my life.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   O   O   O

4. Unfortunately, that bag is too expensive. I can't afford it.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   O   O   O

5. I can't pay because my wallet is stolen.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   O   O   O

6. I haven't had time to do a lot of homework last week.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   O   O   O

7. My bicycle isn't here any more. Somebody has taken it.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   O   O   O

8. When did you gave up smoking?

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   O   O   O

9. I speaked at my father's retirement party last year.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   O   O   O

10. I can amuse me very well on my own.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   O   O   O

11. Harry didn't get any birthday presents yesterday.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   O   O   O

12. His hair is very short. He has had a haircut.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   O   O   O

13. Bob and Alice are married. They are married for 20 years.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   O   O   O

14. Hello Tom and Lisa! Congratulations on your wedding day.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   ○   ○   ○

15. She is happy because she passed her exam.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   ○   ○   ○

16. I didn't see my friends for ages, so it is a pity I can't see them tonight.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   ○   ○   ○

17. On Friday I went to a friend's birthday party.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   ○   ○   ○

18. Yesterday, I have been too busy to even think about anything else.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   ○   ○   ○

19. Susan has worked at McDonalds for 5 years. She really likes it there.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   ○   ○   ○

20. I really like Brad Pitt. I always wanted to meet him.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   ○   ○   ○

21. I will see you in an hour.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   ○   ○   ○

22. Susan played tennis since she was eight years old.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   ○   ○   ○

23. She is already a hour late.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   ○   ○   ○

24. Emma hurt her finger at school yesterday.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   O   O   O

25. London is a nice place to live. I have lived there all my life.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   O   O   O

26. She only get five birthday presents yesterday

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   O   O   O

27. My sister weren't born in 1980

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   O   O   O

28. I didn't ate anything this morning because I wasn't hungry.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   O   O   O

29. I cycled to school this morning because my parents' car was at the garage.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   O   O   O

30. I have visited France three times so far.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   O   O   O

Appendix F: GJT (Posttest)

Is this sentence correct or incorrect?

Naam: *jongen / meisje*

Leeftijd:

Vind je het vak Engels leuk?

Hoe goed ben je in het vak Engels?   *goed / gemiddeld / matig / onvoldoende*

In deze opdracht moet je de gegeven zinnen beoordelen op hun grammaticaliteit: zijn de zinnen grammaticaal geformuleerd of niet? Je hoeft dus niet te letten op spelling en interpunctie. Je hebt steeds 3 opties waaruit je kunt kiezen bij het beoordelen van de zinnen: correct, incorrect, of ik weet het niet. Je hoeft zinnen verder niet te verbeteren. Meestal is je eerste antwoord goed, dus geef na het lezen van iedere zin direct antwoord. Je krijgt 10 minuten voor de opdracht, maar waarschijnlijk zul je niet zoveel tijd nodig hebben. Het is wel belangrijk dat je alleen werkt.

Een voorbeeld:

My sister really like shopping.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
  ⊗   O   O

Beoordeel de volgende zinnen op hun grammaticaliteit:

1. Emma hurt her finger at school yesterday.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   O   O   O

2. Susan has worked at McDonalds for 5 years. She really likes it there.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   O   O   O

3. I bought two pairs of jeans, because my old ones are too short.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   O   O   O

4. I speaked at my father's retirement party last year.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   ○   ○   ○

5. Do you know what time *Mathilda* is on TV?

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   ○   ○   ○

6. Bob and Alice are married. They are married for 20 years.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   ○   ○   ○

7. I have visited France three times so far.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   ○   ○   ○

8. I didn't ate anything this morning because I wasn't hungry.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   ○   ○   ○

9. She only get five birthday presents yesterday

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   ○   ○   ○

10. I really like Brad Pitt. I always wanted to meet him.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   ○   ○   ○

11. I will see you in an hour.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   ○   ○   ○

12. Eats your child better now than in the past?

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   ○   ○   ○

13. Harry didn't get any birthday presents yesterday.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   ○   ○   ○

14. His hair is very short. He has had a haircut.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
  ○   ○   ○

15. I have never seen a dolphin in my life.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
  ○   ○   ○

16. Did you see that film on television last night?

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
  ○   ○   ○

17. I think *Friends* is the best series on TV.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
  ○   ○   ○

18. I visited my grandparents last weekend.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
  ○   ○   ○

19. My sister weren't born in 1980

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
  ○   ○   ○

20. Susan played tennis since she was eight years old.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
  ○   ○   ○

21. I cycled to school this morning because my parents' car was at the garage.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
  ○   ○   ○

22. London is a nice place to live. I have lived there all my life.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
  ○   ○   ○

23. I didn't see my friends for ages, so it is a pity I can't see them tonight.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
  ○   ○   ○

24. She is already a hour late.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
◯   ◯   ◯

25. I haven't had time to do a lot of homework last week.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
◯   ◯   ◯

26. Unfortunately, that bag is too expensive. I can't afford it.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
◯   ◯   ◯

27. A book reads she sometimes, but she more often reads magazines.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
◯   ◯   ◯

28. She is happy because she passed her exam.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
◯   ◯   ◯

29. On Friday I went to a friend's birthday party.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
◯   ◯   ◯

30. When did you gave up smoking?

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
◯   ◯   ◯

31. Hello Jack and Mary! Congratulations on your wedding day.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
◯   ◯   ◯

32. My bicycle isn't here any more. Somebody has taken it.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
◯   ◯   ◯

33. As usual arrived James too late.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
◯   ◯   ◯

34. I can't pay because my wallet is stolen.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet

○   ○   ○

35. I can amuse me very well on my own.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet

○   ○   ○

36. Yesterday, I have been too busy to even think about anything else.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet

○   ○   ○

Appendix G: GJT (Retention task)

Is this sentence correct or incorrect?

Naam: *jongen / meisje*

Leeftijd:

Vind je het vak Engels leuk?

Hoe goed ben je in het vak Engels?   *goed / gemiddeld / matig / onvoldoende*

In deze opdracht moet je de gegeven zinnen beoordelen op hun grammaticaliteit: zijn de zinnen grammaticaal geformuleerd of niet? Je hoeft dus niet te letten op spelling en punctuatie. Je hebt steeds 3 opties waaruit je kunt kiezen bij het beoordelen van de zinnen: correct, incorrect, of ik weet het niet. Je hoeft zinnen verder niet te verbeteren. Meestal is je eerste antwoord goed, dus geef na het lezen van iedere zin direct antwoord. Je krijgt 10 minuten voor de opdracht, maar waarschijnlijk zul je niet zoveel tijd nodig hebben. Het is wel belangrijk dat je alleen werkt.

Een voorbeeld:

My sister really like shopping.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   ⨯   O   O

Beoordeel de volgende zinnen op hun grammaticaliteit:

1. London is a nice place to live. I have lived there all my life.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   O   O   O

2. I didn't see my friends for ages, so it is a pity I can't see them tonight.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   O   O   O

3. She is already a hour late.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   O   O   O

4. I haven't had time to do a lot of homework last week.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   ○   ○   ○

5. Unfortunately, that bag is too expensive. I can't afford it.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   ○   ○   ○

6. As usual arrived James too late.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   ○   ○   ○

7. I can't pay because my wallet is stolen.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   ○   ○   ○

8. I think *Friends* is the best series on TV.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   ○   ○   ○

9. I visited my grandparents last weekend.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   ○   ○   ○

10. My sister weren't born in 1980

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   ○   ○   ○

11. Susan played tennis since she was eight years old.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   ○   ○   ○

12. I bought two pairs of jeans, because my old ones are too short.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   ○   ○   ○

13. I speaked at my father's retirement party last year.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   ○   ○   ○

14. His hair is very short. He has had a haircut.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   ○   ○   ○

15. She only get five birthday presents yesterday

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
○   ○   ○

16. I really like Brad Pitt. I always wanted to meet him.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
○   ○   ○

17. I will see you in an hour.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
○   ○   ○

18. Eats your child better now than in the past?

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
○   ○   ○

19. Harry didn't get any birthday presents yesterday.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
○   ○   ○

20. On Friday I went to a friend's birthday party.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
○   ○   ○

21. When did you gave up smoking?

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
○   ○   ○

22. Do you know what time *Mathilda* is on TV?

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
○   ○   ○

23. Yesterday, I have been too busy to even think about anything else.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
○   ○   ○

24. Bob and Alice are married. They are married for 20 years.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
○   ○   ○

25. I have never seen a dolphin in my life.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   O   O   O

26. Did you see that film on television last night?

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   O   O   O

27. I cycled to school this morning because my parents' car was at the garage.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   O   O   O

28. She is happy because she passed her exam.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   O   O   O

29. Hello Jack and Mary! Congratulations on your wedding day.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   O   O   O

30. My bicycle isn't here any more. Somebody has taken it.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   O   O   O

31. Susan has worked at McDonalds for 5 years. She really likes it there.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   O   O   O

32. I have visited France three times so far.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   O   O   O

33. I didn't ate anything this morning because I wasn't hungry.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   O   O   O

34. Emma hurt her finger at school yesterday.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   O   O   O

35. I can amuse me very well on my own.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   ○   ○   ○

36. A book reads she sometimes, but she more often reads magazines.

Incorrect   Correct   Ik weet het niet
   ○   ○   ○